





## Analysis of Hop Limit in Opportunistic Networks by Static and Time-Aggregated Graphs

Suzan Bayhan\*, Esa Hyytiä, Jussi Kangasharju\* and Jörg Ott

\*University of Helsinki and Aalto University, Finland

MWN-104: Wireless Relay Networks, 17:15-18:00 ICC Capital Hall Interactive 2



Aalto University School of Science

#### Many mobile devices with different types of

content stored locally





Aalto University School of Science

#### Carried by users



MWN-104: Wireless Relay Networks Bayhan *et al.*, IEEE ICC 2015



Aalto University School of Science

Short range radio, e.g., Bluetooth, Wifi Direct



MWN-104: Wireless Relay Networks Bayhan *et al.*, IEEE ICC 2015



MWN-104: Wireless Relay Networks Bayhan *et al.*, IEEE ICC 2015





## Hop limitations are applied to keep routing scalable and resource-efficient.

Source De	estination	Relaying	Hop limit
node	node	nodes	





## Hop limitations are applied to keep routing scalable and resource-efficient.





## Hop-Limited Routing



### A message can be forwarded to at most **h** hops



MWN-104: Wireless Relay Networks Bayhan *et al.*, IEEE ICC 2015



Hop = 0



Message created

## Destination

MWN-104: Wireless Relay Networks Bayhan *et al.*, IEEE ICC 2015



MWN-104: Wireless Relay Networks Bayhan *et al.*, IEEE ICC 2015







destination reached

MWN-104: Wireless Relay Networks Bayhan *et al.*, IEEE ICC 2015









Other nodes may not be aware of the delivery of the message to the destination.



Analysis of Hop Limit in Opportunistic Networks by Static and Time-Aggregated Graphs

0

**Aalto University** 

**School of Science** 

MWN-104: Wireless Relay Networks Bayhan et al., IEEE ICC 2015





# How does hop limit affect opportunistic routing?

## average time to send a packet

## 2 fraction of nodes reachable



MWN-104: Wireless Relay Networks Bayhan *et al.*, IEEE ICC 2015





## analysis approaches

http://www.lettercult.com/archives/3196

## Static graph

## Time-aggregated graphs

## Simulations

MWN-104: Wireless Relay Networks Bayhan *et al.*, IEEE ICC 2015







MWN-104: Wireless Relay Networks Bayhan *et al.*, IEEE ICC 2015







single graph, observe the network in several time points, and create the network topology → Time-aggregated graph MWN-104: Wireless Relay Networks Bayhan *et al.*, IEEE ICC 2015

![](_page_19_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_2.jpeg)

#### $D \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow E$ in static graph

![](_page_19_Picture_4.jpeg)

MWN-104: Wireless Relay Networks Bayhan *et al.*, IEEE ICC 2015

![](_page_20_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_2.jpeg)

#### $D \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow E$ in static graph

![](_page_20_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_5.jpeg)

MWN-104: Wireless Relay Networks Bayhan *et al.*, IEEE ICC 2015

#### Time interval 2

![](_page_20_Picture_8.jpeg)

Only  $D \rightarrow B$  in this second graph  $B \rightarrow C$  link is missing

![](_page_20_Picture_11.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Picture_2.jpeg)

 $D \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow E$  in static graph

Aalto University School of Science

Time-aggregation results in loss of temporal dynamics but simplistic

Static graph **overestimates** the connectivity and hence the capacity

<u>Time interval 1</u>

![](_page_21_Picture_8.jpeg)

MWN-104: Wireless Relay Networks Bayhan *et al.*, IEEE ICC 2015 Time interval 2

![](_page_21_Picture_11.jpeg)

does it affect?

How much

Only  $D \rightarrow B$  in this second graph  $B \rightarrow C$  link is missing

![](_page_22_Picture_0.jpeg)

IEEE/ACM TRANSACTIONS ON NETWORKING, VOL. 10, NO. 5, OCTOBER 2002

#### Computing Shortest Paths for Any Number of Hops

Roch Guérin, Fellow, IEEE, and Ariel Orda, Senior Member, IEEE

Abstract-In this paper, we introduce and investigate a "new" over paths that are capable of meeting them (see [1] for a path optimization problem that we denote the all hops optimal path (AHOP) problem. The problem involves identifying, for all hop counts, the optimal, i.e., minimum weight, path(s) between a given source and destination(s). The AHOP problem arises naturally in the context of quality-of-service (QoS) routing in networks, where routes (paths) need to be computed that provide services guar-

comprehensive survey). Furthermore, for efficiency purposes, it is also important to do so at the minimum possible cost to the network

From an algorithmic standpoint, this calls for algorithms that compute paths satisfying specific (service) constraints, while

![](_page_22_Picture_8.jpeg)

## AH()P All Hops Optimal Paths

All Hops Optimal Path (AHOP) Problem: For a given source node  $s \in \mathcal{V}$  and maximal hop count H, H < N, find, for each hop count value  $h, 1 \le h \le H$ , and destination node  $u \in \mathcal{V}$ , an h-hop constrained optimal path between s and u.

MWN-104: Wireless Relay Networks Bayhan et al., IEEE ICC 2015

![](_page_23_Picture_0.jpeg)

Q1: Average time to send a packet Path length

- Q2: Fraction of nodes reachable
- Size of the connected component

Q3: Delivery ratio

Probability of the existence of a path 🔍 w1

![](_page_23_Picture_6.jpeg)

w2

w3

![](_page_24_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Figure_3.jpeg)

- Optimal path p\* from A to D is the path with minimum w(p) among all paths from A to D.
- Hop-limited optimal path p\* is p<sub>h</sub>\* where length(p<sub>h</sub>\*) <= h</li>
- o Given the edge weights, what is the weight of p, w(p)?

![](_page_25_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Picture_2.jpeg)

o w(p) = w(A,B) + w(B,C) + w(C,D) → Additive weightso  $w(p) = max\{w(A,B), w(B,C), w(C,D)\} → Bottleneck weights$ 

Additive weight: Path weight = routing delay

 weight of an edge: inter-contact time between the corresponding nodes

Bottleneck weight (capacity): A routing scheme should choose the paths that will highly probably exist  $\rightarrow$  most probable paths.

 weight of an edge: the inverse of the number of encounters between the corresponding nodes

![](_page_26_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Picture_2.jpeg)

#### Corresponding network topology

![](_page_26_Figure_4.jpeg)

MWN-104: Wireless Relay Networks Bayhan *et al.*, IEEE ICC 2015

![](_page_27_Picture_0.jpeg)

## Nume Rical Evaluation

**R** for graphs and AHOP (*timeordered* package Benjamin Blonder) **ONE** for simulations

![](_page_27_Picture_4.jpeg)

**Aalto University** 

**School of Science** 

MWN-104: Wireless Relay Networks Bayhan *et al.*, IEEE ICC 2015

![](_page_28_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Picture_3.jpeg)

### TABLE I

![](_page_28_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Picture_6.jpeg)

#### NDAD http://crawdad.cs.dartmouth.edu/

Community Resource for Archiving Wireless Data At Dartmouth

![](_page_29_Figure_0.jpeg)

MWN-104: Wireless Relay Networks Bayhan *et al.*, IEEE ICC 2015

![](_page_30_Figure_0.jpeg)

Delivery ratio increases while delay decreases with increasing h

![](_page_31_Figure_0.jpeg)

Delivery ratio increases while delay decreases with increasing h

![](_page_32_Picture_0.jpeg)

MWN-104: Wireless Relay Networks Bayhan *et al.*, IEEE ICC 2015

![](_page_33_Figure_0.jpeg)

MWN-104: Wireless Relay Networks Bayhan *et al.*, IEEE ICC 2015

# Revisiting our research

![](_page_34_Picture_1.jpeg)

## average time to send a packet

- Nodes can be reached faster by relaxing hop count
- Improvement vanishes after several hops
- Optimal hop counts (total path delay): 2-3 hops

## 2 fraction of nodes reachable

The first two hops are sufficient to reach every node from every other node.

## 3 delivery ratio

increases significantly if at least two hops are allowed, and stabilizes after h approx. 4.

MWN-104: Wireless Relay Networks Bayhan *et al.*, IEEE ICC 2015

![](_page_35_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Picture_2.jpeg)

Time-aggregated graphs

### Three aggregation windows

![](_page_35_Figure_5.jpeg)

MWN-104: Wireless Relay Networks Bayhan *et al.*, IEEE ICC 2015

![](_page_35_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_36_Picture_0.jpeg)

Aalto University School of Science

 $G_{1}^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 10 \\ 20 \\ 30 \\ 40 \\ 50 \\ 60 \\ 70 \\ Snapshot index \\$ 

MWN-104: Wireless Relay Networks Bayhan *et al.*, IEEE ICC 2015

![](_page_37_Figure_0.jpeg)

MWN-104: Wireless Relay Networks Bayhan *et al.*, IEEE ICC 2015

![](_page_38_Picture_0.jpeg)

SITY OF HELSINKI

Time-aggregated graphs Hop vs. reached fraction

![](_page_38_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Figure_3.jpeg)

Larger time-window, higher reached fraction

Acc. to static analysis, 2 hops are enough to reach all. But lower connectivity for others.

Trend is the same (h=2 achieves most of the gains of multi-hop routing).

## Network snapshots Hop count vs. capacity

![](_page_39_Picture_1.jpeg)

HELSINGIN YLIOPISTO HELSINGFORS UNIVERSITET UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

![](_page_39_Figure_3.jpeg)

#### • Highest increase from h=1 to h=2

• After h=4, vanishingly small gain

MWN-104: Wireless Relay Networks Bayhan *et al.*, IEEE ICC 2015

## Network snapshots Hop count vs. capacity

![](_page_40_Picture_1.jpeg)

HELSINGIN YLIOPISTO HELSINGFORS UNIVERSITET UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

![](_page_40_Figure_3.jpeg)

Highest increase from h=1 to h=2
After h=4, vanishingly small gain

MWN-104: Wireless Relay Networks Bayhan *et al.*, IEEE ICC 2015

## Network snapshots Hop count vs. capacity

![](_page_41_Picture_1.jpeg)

HELSINGIN YLIOPISTO HELSINGFORS UNIVERSITET UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

![](_page_41_Figure_3.jpeg)

Short and medium aggregation windows closer to reality

MWN-104: Wireless Relay Networks Bayhan *et al.*, IEEE ICC 2015

![](_page_42_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_42_Picture_1.jpeg)

### **AHOP** analysis

![](_page_42_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_42_Figure_5.jpeg)

Bottleneck capacity: inverse of number of encounters

MWN-104: Wireless Relay Networks Bayhan *et al.*, IEEE ICC 2015

![](_page_43_Picture_0.jpeg)

UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

## Simulations

![](_page_43_Picture_2.jpeg)

★…★…★…★…★…★ 0.8  $-\diamond - \diamond - \diamond - \diamond - \diamond$ \* Infocom05, ttl=1 hour Infocom06, ttl=1 hour Infocom05, ttl=6 hours Delivery ratio 0.6 Infocom06, ttl=6 hours Infocom05, ttl=24 hours Infocom06, ttl=24 hours 0.4 0.2 2 6 8 10 4 Hop count (h)

 Agrees our previous analysis

Trend is the same
h=2 highest improvement
h>4 stability

![](_page_43_Figure_6.jpeg)

MWN-104: Wireless Relay Networks Bayhan *et al.*, IEEE ICC 2015

## Simulations Delivery delay and path lengths

HELSINGIN YLIOPISTO HELSINGFORS UNIVERSITET UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

![](_page_44_Figure_2.jpeg)

#### **AHOP** analysis

**School of Science** 

![](_page_44_Figure_4.jpeg)

Additive weight: inter-contact time

MWN-104: Wireless Relay Networks Bayhan *et al.*, IEEE ICC 2015

![](_page_45_Picture_0.jpeg)

## Summary

![](_page_45_Picture_3.jpeg)

## Effect of hop count

- Capacity of the studied human contact networks increases significantly with h>=2
- Improvement vanishes after h=4

## Effect of analysis approach

- Static graph approach overestimates connectivity and performance
- Time window of the aggregation should be paid attention to

![](_page_46_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_46_Picture_1.jpeg)

### http://www.netlab.tkk.fi/tutkimus/pdp/

![](_page_46_Figure_3.jpeg)

MWN-104: Wireless Relay Networks Bayhan *et al.*, IEEE ICC 2015

![](_page_47_Picture_0.jpeg)

Aalto University School of Science

HELSINGFORS UNIVERSITET UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

HELSINGIN YLIOPISTO

- Guérin, Roch, and Ariel Orda, "Computing shortest paths for any number of hops." IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking (TON) 10.5 (2002): 613-620.
- M. Vojnovic and A. Proutiere, "Hop limited flooding over dynamic networks," in Proceedings IEEE INFOCOM, 2011, pp. 685–693.
- M. Vojnovic and A. Proutiere, "Hop limited flooding over dynamic networks," in Proceedings IEEE INFOCOM, 2011, pp. 685–693.
- B. Blonder, T. W. Wey, A. Dornhaus, R. James, and A. Sih, "Temporal dynamics and network analysis," Methods in Ecology and Evolution, vol. 3, no. 6, pp. 958–972, 2012.
- A. Casteigts, P. Flocchini, W. Quattrociocchi, and N. Santoro, "Time-varying graphs and dynamic networks," Int. Journal of Parallel, Emergent and Distributed Systems, vol. 27, no. 5, pp. 387–408, 2012.
- Burdakov, Oleg P., et al. Optimal placement of communications relay nodes. Department of Mathematics, Linköpings universitet, 2009.

#### Analysis of Hop Limit in Opportunistic Networks by Static and Time-Aggregated Graphs

Suzan Bayhan\*, Esa Hyytiä<sup>†</sup>, Jussi Kangasharju\*, and Jörg Ott<sup>†</sup> \* Department of Computer Science, University of Helsinki, Finland Email: bayhan@hiit.fi, jakangas@es.helsinki.fi <sup>†</sup>Department of Communications and Networking (COMNET), Aalto University, Finland Email: {esa, jo}@metlab.tkk.fi

Abstract-Hop count limitation helps controlling the spread of messages as well as the protocol complexity and overhead in a distributed network. For a mobile opportunistic network, we examine how the paths between any two nodes change with increasing number of hops a message can follow. Using the all hops optimal path (AHOP) problem, we represent the total delay of a route from a source node to a destination node as additive weight and use the number of encounters as a representation of bottleneck weight. First, we construct a static (contact) graph from the meetings recorded in a human contact trace and then analyze the change in these two weights with increasing hop count. Alternatively, we aggregate all the contact events in a time interval and construct several time-aggregated graphs over which we calculate the capacity metrics. Although, we observe differences in the properties of the static and the time-aggregated graphs (e.g., higher connectivity and average degree in static graph), our analysis shows that second hop brings most of the benefits of multi-hop routing for the studied networks. However, he optimal paths ---path that provides the most desirable

networks (e.g., short contact duration). A less greedy solution is hop-limited routing [3], [4] which limits the journey of a message in the network to maximum h hops. More sophisticated protocols aim to balance the tradeoff between delivery ratio and resource consumption by tuning the protocol parameters, e.g., the maximum number of replications [4], lifetime of a message [5], replication/forwarding logic [6], and so on. However, no matter how optimized the protocol is, the performance of a mobile opportunistic network also strongly depends on the node mobility. More specifically, two properties related to node mobility are paramount: contact duration and inter-contact time duration. Contact duration is the time two nodes stay connected while inter-contact time is the time elapsed between two consequent contacts of two particular nodes. Both determine the transmission capacity (i.e., how much data can be transmitted) as well as the speed

Available at <u>http://www.hiit.fi/u/bayhan/</u>

![](_page_48_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_48_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_48_Picture_2.jpeg)

## Analysis of Hop Limit in Opportunistic Networks by Static and Time-Aggregated Graphs

Suzan Bayhan\*, Esa Hyytiä, Jussi Kangasharju\* and Jörg Ott

\*University of Helsinki and Aalto University, Finland

MWN-104: Wireless Relay Networks, 17:15-18:00 ICC Capital Hall Interactive 2